



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.4111/icu.2016.57.3.155](https://doi.org/10.4111/icu.2016.57.3.155)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Challacombe, B., Blecher, G., & Catterwell, R. (2016). Expanding indications in robotic upper renal tract surgery: The sky's the limit. *Investigative and clinical urology*, 57(3), 155-156. <https://doi.org/10.4111/icu.2016.57.3.155>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Expanding indications in robotic upper renal tract surgery: The sky's the limit

With over 4,000 da Vinci robotic systems in operation throughout the world performing mainly prostate and gynaecological surgery there seems to be plenty of capacity and opportunity to expand robotic indications even further. Whilst robotic partial nephrectomy (RPN) has become an established technique in many centres there remains some reluctance to use this technology across the wider spectrum of upper renal tract disease. The enhanced 3-dimensional optics, tremor elimination, precise dissection and suturing ease permitted with the robotic system lends itself to the delicate complexities of upper renal tract surgery. Those aspects of upper tract surgery that require reconstruction are particularly suitable for robotic assistance.

Since the first RPN by Gettman et al. [1] in 2005, it has become increasingly obvious that use of the robotic approach has significant benefits in terms of a reduction in warm ischaemia times when compared to laparoscopic surgery [2]. It may also allow a quicker procedure, a reduction in intra-operative complications such as vascular injuries due improved suturing dexterity, and the ability for more surgeons to perform procedures of higher complexity. The recent British Association of Urological Surgeons audit in the United Kingdom [3], where all urologists performing nephrectomies are mandated to submit their personal data each year, shows significant advantages to a robotic approach when compared with the open or laparoscopic counterparts. This audit looked at over 1,400 partial nephrectomies over 3 years across the country and showed improvements in positive margin rates, intra and postoperative complications, and length of hospital stay. There was no recording of warm ischaemic times or tumour complexity in the initial audit so case selection will have had an impact on these results for the different approaches. Despite this the data represents a national perspective rather than just the highest volume centres and seems

to clearly indicate that if a minimally invasive partial nephrectomy is indicated, it may be optimally performed robotically. Thus for the vast majority of tumours we feel that RPN represents the current Gold standard.

With regards to laparoscopic radical nephrectomy most urologists would not routinely use the robot for this relatively routine task. However we feel there are several potential advantages to its use. For instance the procedure may well be quicker than the standard laparoscopic approach enabling more cases (3 or 4) to be carried out in an all-day operating list. If the robot and maintenance contract are already in place in the hospital it may be cost neutral as many laparoscopic disposables are eliminated such as a Harmonic Scalpel or Ligasure device and disposable ports [4]. Robotic radical nephrectomy uses the same port placement and set-up as partial nephrectomy so is ideal for training within a fellowship programme. Small improvements in the quality of the robotic case may permit increased confidence allowing surgery without using a wound drain or even a urethral catheter. Perhaps the key advantage of robotic radical nephrectomy is the potential to expand the indications for minimally invasive renal surgery to include patients with tumours who would otherwise be deemed too complex for laparoscopic surgery. Most larger tumours >10 cm, those invading adjacent organs, those carried out for cytoreductive indications, or those with clear venous invasion are avoided by laparoscopic nephrectomists. The additional control and dexterity provided by robotics brings many of these cases into the remit of the robotic surgeon. There are now case series of tumours with significant renal vein, levels I–III thrombi successfully managed robotically [5].

The challenge of nephro-ureterectomy for upper tract transitional cell carcinoma (TCC) is often not the nephrectomy component but the ureterectomy component

where precise dissection of the distal ureter and accurate closure of the cystotomy defect are paramount. There is no doubt from our perspective, having performed many with both approaches, that compared with laparoscopic surgery the robotic approach adds an increase in quality to this step and also makes lymphadenectomy more feasible. Although costs have been shown to be higher, postoperative complications seem reduced [6]. The optimal bladder closure with a robotic approach permits early removal of catheter, the ability to safely instill intravesical chemotherapy and hence can decrease length of stay.

With regards to the less common retroperitoneal procedures the robotic system can usually add some technical quality to the operations. Whilst adrenalectomy is a very established laparoscopic technique, dissection around the great vessels and particularly the inferior vena cava can be fraught with danger. In the event of a major vascular injury use of the enhanced suturing permitted by the da Vinci system may make the difference between conversion to open surgery or salvaging the situation. Less stressful reconstructive procedures such as a dismembered pyeloplasty, ureteric reimplantation and ureterolysis for retroperitoneal fibrosis may all benefit from robotic dexterity [7].

There are however many potential disadvantages of using the robot over a pure laparoscopic approach. The main downside stated is clearly cost as the system still costs almost \$1.5 million to purchase and comes with an expensive maintenance contract. If the robot has already been purchased for pelvic surgery (prostate/gynaecology) then these costs are far less, and extending indications to the upper tract becomes more appealing. From a practical perspective there are also disadvantages in terms of robotic specific complications due to untrained and inexperienced use of the system. The distance between the console surgeon and the assistant can lead to misunderstanding and poor communication whilst operating in an area where significant bleeding can occur without warning with dramatic consequences. Judging tension when elevating structures takes experience and although suturing is easier it still requires training and practice. Assistant instruments can occasionally become inadvertently lodged beneath robotic arms due to lack of tactile feedback and diathermy arcing can occur from robotic scissors into adjacent structures causing damage and potential haemorrhage. Like all complex surgical tools dedication to training and ongoing audit and assessment of one's performance are vital.

Despite these potential problems overall we feel that units with an established robotic programme should try and get the most out of their costly equipment. Expanding

the upper tract programme has many potential advantages in terms of health economics and clinical delivery. When compared to laparoscopic procedures it is often possible to perform a whole range of operations more quickly, more safely and with additional quality in an integrated robotic renal tract programme. When it comes to the upper urinary tract we feel the sky's the limit.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors have nothing to disclose.

Ben Challacombe, Gideon Blecher, Rick Catterwell

Corresponding Author: Ben Challacombe

Guy's and St Thomas' Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

and Kings College, London, UK

E-mail: benchallacombe@doctors.org.uk

REFERENCES

1. Gettman MT, Blute ML, Chow GK, Neururer R, Bartsch G, Peschel R. Robotic-assisted laparoscopic partial nephrectomy: technique and initial clinical experience with DaVinci robotic system. *Urology* 2004;64:914-8.
2. Aboumarzouk OM, Stein RJ, Eyraud R, Haber GP, Chlosta PL, Somani BK, et al. Robotic versus laparoscopic partial nephrectomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Urol* 2012;62: 1023-33.
3. The British Association of Urological Surgeons. Patients nephrectomy outcomes data. Audit 2012-14 [Internet]. London: The British Association of Urological Surgeons; c2016 [cited 2016 Apr 24]. Available from: www.baus.org.uk/patients/surgical_outcomes/nephrectomy/default.aspx.
4. Alemozaffar M, Chang SL, Kacker R, Sun M, DeWolf WC, Wagner AA. Comparing costs of robotic, laparoscopic, and open partial nephrectomy. *J Endourol* 2013;27:560-5.
5. Petros FG, Angell JE, Abaza R. Outcomes of robotic nephrectomy including highest-complexity cases: largest series to date and literature review. *Urology* 2015;85:1352-8.
6. Trudeau V, Gandaglia G, Shiffmann J, Popa I, Shariat SF, Montorsi F, et al. Robot-assisted versus laparoscopic nephroureterectomy for upper-tract urothelial cancer: a population-based assessment of costs and perioperative outcomes. *Can Urol Assoc J* 2014;8:E695-701.
7. Marien T, Bjurlin MA, Wynia B, Bilbily M, Rao G, Zhao LC, et al. Outcomes of robotic-assisted laparoscopic upper urinary tract reconstruction: 250 consecutive patients. *BJU Int* 2015;116:604-11.